

WISDOMS

WHILE YOU WAIT

If Things Cannot be Turned from Their Course by Prayer, Why Do Christians Pray?

(By C. Cohen)

The following is reproduced from the columns of the London Freethinker. The writer says in part:—

[illegible]

OLD MAN. For May 30, Mr. Warshawski leads off with a reply to a student who has been converted from Agnosticism by the preaching of Mr. Campbell. One feels a certain curiosity to know how the student converted to Agnosticism that crumpled up so readily, and also as to which were the arguments of Mr. Campbell that brought about the conversion. To the student, however, the conversion was not so easily won, and he was well adapted for the work of meeting and destroying the Pretheenth position as it is for solving the problem of perpetual motion. Still, the case is not a very good one for Agnosticism. It is worth. This correspondent, however, is still in trouble about the efficacy of prayer. He has not yet reached the point of believing in a God; and he is not sure that he can get there, as to what use he can put him in. Probably as a reminiscence of his earlier state, he asks: "are not the laws of nature God's laws? And are we not bound to obey them? And are we not moral beings, asking God to break his laws in our favor?" Mr. Warshawski's reply—conceiving that a column is a first-rate example in the art of writing—does not seem to answer over coming with striking distance of it. The question, he says, is one of which answering as clearly as "possible," and straightway proceeds to answer it. He says that he is not, we are told, breaking the great natural forces in subduing them to our service, our prayers may signify nothing, and that is the question which may bring about the desired end. This is reasonable" when we consider that everything in the physical sphere is ultimately brought about by the force of non-physical, viz., thought.

Now, this is not only not minking the answer as clear as possible; it is adding, quite unnecessarily, a piece of metaphysics to the answer. To say that everything in the physical universe is brought about by something non-physical is a mere metaphysical statement unsupported, because in capable, of any proof. It is not even good metaphysics either. It may be a reasonable position that both physical and non-physical are merely convenient distinctions, forms of thought useful to us for classificatory purposes; but to dismis the physical as an efficient cause and hang on to the non-physical

an exhibition one ought not to witness in one who writes Master Arts and Doctor of Philosophy after his name. In any case, if doubt is cast upon the very essence of the question is, are things altered by our prayers or are they not? they are not, prayer is obviously useless, and our converted Agnostic is not a person to be trifled with. Following the rest of Mr. Campbell philosophy, it is rather fastidious to strain at this piece. The question would not be answered, be it noted, by making a distinction between the prayer of one, for no reasonable person doubts that any one who believes that praying will make him better man will fall to derive a feeling of benefit from the practice, and from dwelling on his head "swallowing bread pills, or showing 'Mastomaniacs' at five-minute intervals, if his faith took a turn in any of these directions. The consequences of prayer, if they are not altogether positive, are at least not detrimental to the petitioner to be of any evidential value whatever.

Things then, must be altered by our prayers from the fact that we pray. This is not taken, or is it? or pray? And if they are altered it is either verbal trickery or mental confusion that ~~the~~ ^{the} Agnostics do not believe in. The material nature of that prayer ~~is~~ ^{is} the subject having

merely as petition, for material blessing? What is there in prayer's original but petition—for blessings to be good or punishments to be withheld? Would it be a good thing to pray for all this for this reason? And is not the latter view of prayer—that of the community—merely an attempt to retain practice that educated people cannot avoid seeing has no scientific justification? Is it not a good thing for anyone else, to explain what is essential difference between prayer and moral or spiritual blessings as praying for physical ones? What is the difference between praying for material and spiritual blessings? Is the moral improvement of Jack Jones as important as praying for him to be other. A rise in wages, that means a better house, a healthier child, a more contented and greater care of mind and serenity of temper, quite as important as praying that someone may be led to give up his evil life and become a virtuous citizen. Material blessings are very often the means to spiritual ones, and in the complete absence of the former the latter would be impossible. Why, then, is it absurd to pray for the other? Well, we know that a moment of prayer to God will not bring a rise in wages—unless one

employer knows of the praying employee's presence, because our knowledge is sufficiently exact to show us how redemptive it is to expect an answer. It is not absurd to pray for moral improvement, for we know that the prayer will here our ignorance is tolerably correct, and that the prayer is a valuable measure concerning the condition of the soul. The prayer is a measure of change. People's characters do not undergo modification—not suddenly, or by accident, but by the operation of prayer, but gradually, as to be expected by all who have any general conception of the true nature of the human animal—and as we cannot know the exact nature of the modification brought about, the religionist, as usual, trades on the general ignorance by finding here a sphere for the operation of prayer. I do not mean to say that the prayer is so much to clear up the ex-Adam difficulty, although I still marvel at the quality of the Amosélanism taught by the City Temple philosophers. The prayer is a measure of change, and we are concerned with Free Will and the natural God, with each of which I must be brief, one question at a time. If our nature is not a person how is it, if our nature is not a person of God's nature, that we have

Why will it not? The reply is the old-fashioned, and quite stupid, one that if God had made us perfect we should be simply automata, and not moral agents. To this I fancy Huxley's reply, that so long as we are not automata, we are bound to feel the matter. In reality the question has not been faced, the statement concerning "choice" merely pointing to a confusion of thought on the writer's part. What is the question? Is it this: That we are capable of choice is as plain as it is that we have a nose on our face; it is the determination of choice that is the crux of the question. Why do we choose? Why do we choose one rather than another? Why do some people choose differently to others, and why, with the best desire to choose rightly, do we often choose wrongly? Perhaps the question is not so much about the *why* as about the *how* instead of laboriously trying what we can do.

born. The last question dealt with his connection with the nature of God. As the correspondent writes that if there is evil, and also an omnipotent Deity, then God is responsible for the existence of evil; and, as he believes in God, he denies the existence of evil. The author replies that the question of God's responsibility for evil is due to a wrong use of the word "omnipotent." The definition of omnipotence is bounded, he says, in all sorts of ways. A number of illustrations are given, by all of which it is apparently meant that God cannot do anything that would be contrary to the nature of the law. He cannot do anything that is not in accordance with the law, or has no authority or power to do it. He cannot do anything that God can or cannot do; but it is Mr. Warschauer's correct he has demonstrated that man is omnipotent exactly as God is, for he, too, is determined by the laws of his being. The truth is that omnipotence, except in a figurative sense, is a meaningless attribute of Mr. Warschauer either alone or will, not see it. But the

the power to inhabit his own will and allow the wills of other people to be exerted. Thus we have evil without it proving any difficulty to the right thinking of it. Now, again, we must plead ignorance as to why God should have a God-permits evil, only cannot for the life of me see how this makes the case any better. God's almighty, rather than prevent a man's sinning, or prevent him from being able to do as he pleases, or prevent him to act as to bring disease, or misery, or degradation to others. Plain common sense would say that if God could have prevented that evil he should have done so. Warshawer answers, "I am not sure, but I think so." He is not sure, but he is not certain. Perhaps so; but what of the people who are injured by the apathy, or delinquency of God's conduct? Have they no claim to compensation? How can we earth men display of useless world-judging, even over the fact that, at bottom, everyone feels God should have prevented the innocent suffering if he had the power? Any ordinary human being would say that God should have done so. No one would permit evil to be worked merely because it afforded evidence for someone else's moral development. Mr. Warshawer himself would not permit it, and this alone is sufficient proof of the unsoundness of his apology.

display which surrounds death. He wanted his funeral to be simple, and he wanted his body to be cremated. It was his wish that no crape should be placed on the door and all his wishes will be obeyed.

The funeral will be held at 2 p. m. Friday at the residence, 3623 Laclede Ave. Dr. Carl Bareke and several other warm friends will deliver brief addresses. The pallbearers are all former assistants to Dr. Bernays. They are: Drs. Geo. Cayle, Willard Bartlett, Geo. Krebs, W. W. Groves Vogt, R. E. Wilson, Jesse Meyer and Jackson Miller.

Dr. Augustus Chas. Bernays, 53, one of the most noted surgeons in America and an author of wide reputation, died of apoplexy at 4:30 p. m. Wednesday, at his residence, 3623 Laclede Ave. Wednesday afternoon Dr. Bernays was talking to his sister, Miss Thekla Bernays, on the subject of agnosticism and Dr. Bernays made the remark that when he died he did not want any religious service of any kind and didn't want any crepe placed on the door, but wanted to be buried privately and

quately.

Just as he finished talking he gasped, fell back upon the bed and was dead.

Dr. Bernays was the same age as Dr. A. V. L. Brokaw, another famous St. Louis surgeon, who died several months ago.

Dr. Bernays was born in Highland St. Clair county, Ill., and when the family removed to St. Louis he was educated in the public schools there. Later he graduated at McKendree college before he was 18.

He was then sent to Germany and attended the famous Heidelberg university. He graduated at the head of his class in 1876, receiving the "summa cum laude," it being the first time in the history of the university that such an honor was conferred upon an American.

After graduating he took a post graduate course under Baron von Beck at the University of Berlin.

In 1896 he returned to St. Louis and has been practicing in this city ever since.

Before he was 29 he had been made professor of anatomy in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of St. Louis.

Dr. Bernays was acknowledged to be one of the finest operators in this country. He had an assured touch and had performed the "Caesarian" and other difficult operations successfully.

He was unmarried. He is survived by two sisters—Miss Thelka Bernays and Mrs. Lilly Wloskiel, and two brothers—Clemens and Walter.

Big Profits In Borrowing Cheap.

The recent anonymous (communized?) Socialistic Criticism for Capt. Clark along with other characteristic false claims says, 95 percent of American Indians (he probably means Rationalists) are socialists, which certainly is not the case here, nor among the hundreds that I know elsewhere, the very reverse, thereof being much nearer true.

Like Christianity, socialism claims Paine, Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, etc. in fact "claim" everything and prove nothing. Like the Christian's promised socialist heaven, where each has a

similar golden crown, harp, hills, pair of wings, sky-floated man-sions, and bought not by his own effort, but by sacrifice of another christ. Most socialists seem to want a similar monotonous earth donated them down here, hence their similar and brotherhood.

He says, "(the producing class got 42 3/4 per cent of what they produced in 1800 and but 8 per cent in 1900." That

means that capital got 50% per cent in 1900 and now 92 per cent. Yet you can borrow money cheaper now than then, less than six per cent but, even at 6 per cent could make 92 per cent minus 6 per cent equal to 86 per cent net on every dollar you borrow. Why don't socialists borrow and make this difference? Or why not farm for the halves, the landlord paying the taxes, repairs and interest?—D. WEBSTER GROOM

We Have Used Them
St. Insgar, Iowa

Jas. E. Hughes:

Enclosed find a couple of clippings from the Minneapolis Daily News. If they are of no interest, there is no harm done in sending them.

Its Pages Teem with Blasphemy as Shown by Quotations from Texts. No Doubt About Such a Construction

COD EITHER A DISGUSTING SAVAGE OR GIANT

(By Joseph Symes)
The following well written article from the pen of Joseph Symes, the valiant Australian advocate of Free thought, recently returned to England, appeared in the columns of the London Freethinker.

[illegible]

"In the beginning" may be a pleonasm, but it means nothing unless we know of what it indicates the beginning. To say that God made or created the heavens and earth

nik, etc." Without this transportation, the word Bereshith—might taken for the name of the first day, who created the world, as the Talmudic Commentary, by Phylarchus Heron: London, 1883. Here there is a confession: "But only should be read as I have read only that orthodox forbids. I have read only that the word Bereshith must have the order and give it a meaning the author clearly never intended. I have read only that the supreme God made matter and the world, not that 'secondary or subordinate' God created the world. I have read only that the word Genes favors that view somewhat. I have read only that the Talmudic Commentary credits Bereshith with the making of the world, and that the word Bereshith at that time on Bereshith disappeared. Should he some day turn up again, I may make it hot for your orthodox friends, and wish to see their creatures. Let us hope he is not far off." "A jealous God" nor any more revelation.

If Elohim means Gods, as it certainly does, then the whole of chapter of Genesis is Polytheistic, and therefore blasphemous. The wind the Gods moved upon the water the Gods said, "Let light be", the said, "Let there be a firmament", roof, etc., and so on. The earth read, "The G Adam, in likeness,"

we, as Freethinkers, should lose an opportunity exposing those who pretend that the Bible is a Monothestic book. That the latest editors were worshippers of more than one God may be conceded with little demur; but the book has been tampered with to harmonize it to a newer creed; yet plentiful evidences remain in it to show that the original authors of the oldest portions and much besides, were worshippers of more than one God.

[illegible][illegible]

(Continued From Page One.)

BLUE GRASS BLADE

Published at Lexington, Kentucky, Every Sunday.
his death, February 7, 1906.
Founded 1884, and edited by Charles Chilton Moore up to
JAMES E. HUGHES, Editor and Publisher
Subscription Rates.
By mail, postpaid, \$1.50 per year, in advance.
Five new subscribers sent one remittance at \$1.00
per year each.
Trial subscription 15 cents per month.
All foreign subscriptions, postpaid, \$2.00 per year.

ADVERTISING RATES.

ALL ADVERTISEMENTS of whatever character ac-
cepted will be published at the rate of \$1.00 per
line per month, unless by special contract, when
other and better rates will be quoted upon applica-
tion. The publishers have the right to reject any
and all advertisements offered.

GENERAL BUSINESS RULES.

ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS to the Blade will be discontinued
at the expiration of the term for which the sub-
scription has been paid up in advance.
THE MAKE ALL money orders, drafts, checks, etc. payable
to JAMES E. HUGHES, Lexington, Ky., as this
will facilitate collection.

SHOULD ANY SUBSCRIBER change his or her address
advise this office, giving both old and new, and
the Blade will be sent to the new address, as
desired.

THE OFFICE of publication of the Blade is at 126-128
North Limestone Street, Lexington, Kentucky, to
which all Free-thinkers will be given a hearty
welcome.

THE BLADE is entered at the Postoffice at Lexington,
Kentucky, as second class mailing matter.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BLUE
GRASS BLADE, P. O. Box 393, Lexington, Ky.
numbers, or numbers omitted will be sent, if
asked for, upon renewal in case of discontinuance.

Change slip on the paper will show subscribers
the date of expiration of subscription. Back

Move a notch higher.

Honest methods wait for honest men.

The truly strong never ignores the truly weak.

The devil finds many letters for idle hands to write.

Beauty attracts admiration but it takes money to draw interest.

To attempt a great work is bound to make of you a great worker.

There is no profit in friendship that knows no investment of self.

One man's money has built many a man's city.

Graft very
smart business

It takes a man with a lot of earthy brass about him to dispose of the heavenly gold brick.

God and the angels, the son and holy ghost, have all developed into a large pipe dream.

One can never tell what sort of fruit will fall when you begin to shake the orthodox Christian tree.

Christian theology never had the capacity for making fast friends, but it has made fools, hypocrites and enemies by the thousand.

The poet writes glibly about the "footsteps in the sands of time" but he probably never got a pebble in his shoe.

According to that St. Louis preacher the world will never be brought to Christ until new types and methods are in vogue. We opine that when these come in vogue Christ will go way back and sit down.

Those good ladies of Omaha who object to stocking encaused plaster of paris limbs in store windows should get the fire department to turn the hose on the hosiery and all might be well.

When the indictments are all in San Francisco may decide to put the remaining honest men in jail. It would be an awful burden to confine all the others at public expense. One can see what that would mean should justice be properly dealt and still the preachers prate of prayer and faith as a means to saving grace and right doing.

Criticism, like charity, should begin at home, but this is a point seldom thought of by the modern preacher or his followers. As a rule they take kindly to criticising others, especially those who fail to agree with them. Every fault and every foible is magnified until it becomes a mountain of crime and this is why the world needs reforming so much, in the eyes of the Christian believers.

Under our present industrial system the man who toils is fighting a constantly losing battle. He is wearing out heart and hand and brain for a crust that grows scantier every day. While the many battle desperately for life the few piling up fortunes which they cannot use or spend or take with them when they shuffle off this mortal coil. It is poor consolation to point to a Christian heaven and tell the worker that he will find his reward "over there."

"Love one another" taught the apostle of universal peace, but his followers keep at a respectful distance from the precept. It is recorded

from Alliance, Ohio, that a delegation of thirty Christians invaded the meeting of another body of Christians and by using squirt guns filled with a powerful acid they turned the fiery liquid full upon the worshippers while they were assembled about the altar, kneeling in prayer. It is reported that a full dozen were painfully injured while some of them had their clothing almost burned off. What appears to be worse is that the civil authorities took no notice of the incident. This is a so-called Christian land where the saints howl because God is not mentioned in the constitution. How these Christians do love each other.

After spending considerable energy against the terpsichorean art and the ball room, generally, now comes a preacher, in the person of Rev. Rufus A. White, backed up by another preacher, Rev. J. Lloyd Jones, who are giving all possible encouragement to inaugurating dancing in the churches as a counter attraction to the dance halls, and as a means of getting the young people to attend church. The dance halls are condemned by these preachers as "evil resorts" because of the "distractions" that are said to attend them, utterly unmindful of the fact that "distractions" attend the church and Sunday school just as much. The clergy perceive a rapid falling off in church attendance and as the Bible fails to draw the giddy waltz is to be relied upon to do the work. What the preachers in one age condemn, the preachers in another will commend. Perhaps, who knows, the end will justify the means.

In spite of the tearful protestations of Ireland, Corrigan, et al, the French government seems perfectly able to enforce its separation law even if occasional trouble arises. No farmer ever got rid of a nest of snakes without a fight and it was not to be expected that the priests would willingly leave the snap they had been enjoying for years. Papal bulls have no visible effect upon the French leaders and this is wherein they show good sense and good judgment. Religious tirades are no longer effective in civil government and although it has taken labor of years to impress this fact upon the mind of the Vatican a successful impression has at last been made. Were the Pope and his advisers business-wise they would not risk losing other valuable possessions by keeping up a continual agitation of the religious questions to government. France has set a pace for the balance of the world in these matters.

The words enemy of religion and the bible are those who insist upon its inerrancy, those, who strive by some esoteric elchemy of logic to transmute its every fragment of base metal into bars of wisdom's yellow gold. During the dark ages hideous orthodox prevailed and practically every man and every woman was a church member. Today, however, the church is more selfish than altruistic.

There is a tendency to believe that the best way to deal with ignorance is to give it more education. The dogmatists have driven the thinking millions into an overt opposition to the church and these can never be brought back into the faith.

HOW COMES THE MOTHER LOVE?

Whence comes the Mother Love?
How frequently have we been impressed with this sentiment when exhibited by the lower animals.
Christians have long contended that it is a touch of the divine spark alleged to have emanated from a god, some sort of a personal god, without regard to condition or environment.
From the realm of scientific research comes the information that this Mother Love, this regard for offspring, common to mankind and animals of all kinds is built upon purely material and physiological considerations and another lance has pierced the hide of iron-bound orthodoxy.
The study of such a sentiment can be based upon scientific considerations alone. Theology cannot penetrate far enough to decide such an issue. It is beyond the plane of religious thought. The sentiment has nothing in common with the orthodox religion, or with any religion.
It is not even a parallel with the so-called love of God for the children of earth, in that the Mother Love is sweeter, more self-sacrificing, more true and capable than the love of any god for man could possibly be. The Mother would never place her offspring amid the danger of temptation, knowing that her child possessed a sinful, weakening nature, subject to the temptation, ready to yield, and then consign it to an endless hell for falling in temptation's path. This is the way god is said to have treated man and the Mother Love is no argument for a just or merciful god for the god the Christians worship has neither justice or mercy in his makeup.

Henry de Varigny, a French Naturalist and biologist, writing on this subject has furnished much excellent data accompanied with strong argument to back it up. Being worthy of personal and furnishing excellent food for thought, it is here quoted in part:
"Love in the protozoa . . . is evidently very much a physical phenomenon. It resembles the process by which two chemical substances combine. Here, as in a great number of acts which some have seen preferences, antipathies, etc., there are only physico-chemical laws in play. They have much in common, in fact, with movements that take place in inorganic matter, with the inner phenomena of atoms, the processes of crystallization etc., in which the imagination may see the expression of feelings and emotions of a high degree."
"We must, however, reject all imagination and the anthropomorphic sentimentalism that ignores so easily impacts; and the great interest in Giard's work lies in the rigor with which he ex-

cludes all this from his study of mother-love in animals.
"See, for instance, a mother crab carrying about a mass of eggs. Touch one of them and the creature protests with vigor. She becomes angry and opens her huge claws to repel the aggressor. Shall we say that mother-love is quite evident here? This mother defends her young even before they are born."
"To which the naturalist answers . . . that the female who is carrying about a sacculine parasite instead of eggs acts exactly in the same way. The probabilities are that the eggs and the parasite occasion identical sensations and that touching either is equally disagreeable to the crab. There is no mother-love in this, therefore."

"Again, some cochineal insects, after having laid their eggs, die, covering them with their bodies. It is easy to write eloquently of this, in celebration of the heroism of this dying mother who defends her offspring with her own body. But this is pure it has not the strength to go elsewhere. That is all."
"How about the fishes? Mother-love is at least not violent among them. Some leave their eggs at the bottom of the water; others leave them on the surface. . . . Some fish, however, take a certain care of their eggs; the Chinese macropod sucks them up from time to time into its mouth and changes their position. 'Excellent father!' do we say? The truth seems to be that at this time the fish's mouth contains a certain amount of mucus, and that the eggs help to agglutinate this and re-move it."

Certain serpents exhibit a like phenomenon, the writer goes on to say. Those that incubate their eggs manifest apparent signs of mother-love that are rather due, Giard says, to fever. The creature endeavors to cool itself by contact with the eggs and as the fever abates, this desire also lessens. In birds, too, the author insists that what is usually interpreted as maternal feeling may in many cases be ascribed to other causes. Incubation is more common among them than among reptiles, he says, simply because, their bodily temperature is higher and the fever therefore is more marked at the time of setting. But how about the higher animals? Says the writer:

"Many cases have been described where animals have adopted the young of other species when their own have died or have been removed; lionesses have adopted puppies, cats, rabbits or even rats. These cases are counted by the hundreds, and in many of them the adoptive brood belongs to a species which normally lives on bad terms with that of mother. So we are told: 'See the strength of the maternal instinct! This creature desires to be a mother at any price. Her maternal love has undergone perversion, but its existence is very much in evidence.' Naturalists, however, take another view. They regard the adoptive mother's real motive as selfish than altruistic."

In reality, there has been too much attribution to inferior creatures of the aptitudes of the superior, and we have probably, in imagination, put too much of the man into the insect and mollusk. The truth is not so; what is really carried over into the inferior being is the law of brute matter; the elementary psychism of the lower organisms is in turn carried on to the higher creatures. Instead of regarding the lower animals as possessing feelings like those of man, as is incessantly done, we should rather consider the latter as prolonging the animalism of the former. The current is really flowing in the other direction."

LEGAL BLOW AT THE
OBSCENITY PROSECUTIONS.
Through the kindly consideration of a friend the Blade is in receipt of a portion of a copy of the New York Journal, under the date of June 7, which contains an account of the trial and victory of N. L. A. Eastman, of that state, a trial based upon the federal bench in Louisville in the prosecution of the former editor of this paper at the hands of religious fanatics because of the publication of the Virgin Mary article by Grier Kidder. The issues are identically one and the same. In the eyes of religious fanaticism anything is "obscene" which attacks their creeds and formulas, but the courts have held differently and these tribunals have shown that the letter and spirit of the religious and anthropomorphic sentimentalism that ignores so easily impacts; and the great interest in Giard's work lies in the rigor with which he ex-

stitutes an indecent publication!" The devout Christian and the unbeliever in Christian dogmas would each give a different answer. The principle is involved when a person is accused of being a blasphemer. If a man does not believe in God, and God being but an unfounded and unproven theory, it is legally and morally certain that such a man cannot blaspheme God, for he certainly cannot blaspheme that which does not exist. Before God can be blasphemed he must exist and the person blaspheming must believe in his existence. Conversely the idea of blasphemy only exists in the mind of a believer and it is, after all, but an element of religious faith. Acting upon this principle and rendering a liberal construction of the constitutional provisions regarding religious liberty, the courts have refused to sustain prosecutions for blasphemy and they have been careful to discriminate between blasphemy, so-called, and alleged obscenity. In the decision of Judge Evans, as concurred editor C. C. Moore, it was held that while the Kidder article might have been blasphemous, or even sacrilegious, it was not "obscene" as that term was defined by law, and as the former was not offenses against the government of the United States, no offense had been committed and the indictment was dismissed.

Upon an examination of the issues in controversy between the People of the State of New York, appellant, and Newton L. A. Eastman, appellee, we find almost a similar state of facts. The article for which he had been brought to trial was an attack upon the Roman Catholic faith in particular and Christianity, in general. Some harsh and bitter language was used and while the Appellate judges deplored the use of such language in a public print, they could not find that it came within the purview of the law and the accused was discharged. This is a clean cut victory and a decided setback for the pseudo pietists. At the same time it is a clearing away of the pietistical brush for Theodore Schreder, the legal adviser and representative of the Free Speech League in his defense of Bernard MacAdden before the courts of the same state. Eastman and his attorneys are to be congratulated upon the outcome of the trial and the Blade expresses the profound hope that his will be among the last of such trials to be brought before the judicial tribunals of the country.

The article written and published by Eastman was a tirade against the confessional, which he denominated as "sucking language." On the other hand he presented a plea that both men and women, who desire to make a confession of sins, real or imaginary, should "go straight to Jesus Christ and not in a concealed and secluded place, alone with a wicked priest." From this we can but infer that it was a case of one Christian assailing another Christian because of his faith, and not a contest between a believer and an unbeliever. The case was a religious one, and not a case of religious liberty.

But that it does not do violence to the religious freedom of the people, we believe, is self-evident.

New York courts have seen fit to rule so wisely and well. The court was divided in its opinion and dissenting opinions from that of the majority were given.

One of the most peculiar features of the Court's judgment is that in the majority opinion which is given by Chief Justice Cullen, he asserts that the article complained of cannot be "indecent" because of the fact that one of his brother judges, namely, O'Brien, quotes the article in full, and from this he argues that if it were indecent he would not thus consent to its republication even in the law journal. Because of this fact the opinion of the Chief Justice is here given in full for the benefit of Blade readers. He says:

I concur in the opinion of the majority of the court, that the article complained of does not fall within the provisions of section 317 of the Penal Code, under which the defendant was indicted, which section makes it a misdemeanor to sell, give away or show any "obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, indecent or disgusting book, paper or picture," &c. The article is a scurrilous and vile attack on a large and respected body of Christian clergymen is unquestionable. (That it is "indecent" from every consideration of propriety, is also true, but that is not the indecency condemned by this section of the Code. The preceding section punishes indecent exposure of person, the next section the sale of articles for indecent or immoral use. The chapter in which all the sections are found is headed "Indecent exposures, obscene exhibitions, books and prints, and bawdy and other disorderly houses." From the context of the statute it is apparent that it is directed against lewd, lascivious and salacious or obscene publications, the tendency of which it to excite lustful and lecherous desire. That such is not the effect of the publication is clear from the fact that my brother who writes the dissenting opinion publishes it in full, and I am entirely certain that did he believe the tendency of the article was lecherous and salacious he would find it justifiable for its publication in the press and that the majority of the court, from whose decision he feels constrained to dissent, entertain a contrary view. In the English case cited by my brother no part of the improper publication is reproduced, but the report is confined to a statement of its general character. I regret that the publication should appear in the reports of this court not because I deem it lewd, but because I feel that the reports of this court should not be made the means of perpetuating the kind of wanton slander on any class of the community. This is an example of the extent to which sectarian religious animosities may lead a weak and disordered mind, for it is mere charity to consider such to be the character of the writer of the production. Since, however, the article is to appear, I may challenge its comparison with many that have been published attacking the Catholic Church. Surely, publications as to that church have gone far beyond the article now before us. It is no answer to say that the Mormons, while they prac-

Is there any intelligent person on the earth who believes it? The following is what Margaret Ward, who was for three years an inmate of the Convent Court, Bristol, England, says: "In my professional life the depth of corruption and degradation is reached. There the seeds are planted in the soul. The thoughts of a girl are polluted. Her heart is polluted, her mind becomes familiarized with the most revolting impurity. The lessons engraved in the

Considering that Christianity has had the control of education, it is astonishing how many dullheads occupy the pulpit.

Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these

When 1,000 members are enrolled a national delegate convention will be called to formally organize and incorporate the church.
